

**City of Warwick Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes**

**Wednesday, April 5, 2006**

**Members Present:** Attilio Iacobucci  
Philip Slocum  
Jeanne Foster  
Vincent Gambardella  
Michael Constantine  
George Arnold

**Members Absent:** John J. Mulhearn Jr.  
Carter Thomas

**Also in attendance:** John DeLucia, City Engineer  
Eric Hindinger, Assistant City Engineer  
John Earle, Solicitor

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M. by Mr. Iacobucci who in the absence of both the Chairman and Vice-chairman volunteered to chair the meeting.

On the motion of Mr. Slocum, seconded by Mr. Gambardella, the Planning Board voted unanimously to approve the March 2006 meeting minutes.

**Public Meeting**

**Minor Subdivision**

**Gordon Avenue**

**Applicant:** Phillip and Gina Smith  
**Location:** 236 Gordon Avenue  
**Assessor's Plat:** 361  
**Lot(s):** 423, 424 & 453  
**Zoning District:** Residential A-7  
**Land Area:** 14,098 square feet  
**Number of lots:** 2  
**Engineer:** Robert E. Winward, PLS.  
**Ward:** 6

Robert Winward PLS, represented the applicant and was requesting preliminary approval to subdivide three lots to create two new lots, one lot with an existing dwelling and one new lot for development on an existing street in a Residential A-7 zoning district.

Mr. Winward explained that the total land area consists of 14,098 square feet and that the applicant was proposing to create two lots in full conformance with the City's zoning regulations.

Being no questions or comments regarding the proposal, the Planning Board heard the Planning Department recommendation.

The Planning Department found the proposal to be generally consistent with Article 1 "Purposes and General Statements" of the City's Development Review Regulations, and:

- 1) Generally consistent with the Comprehensive Community Plan.
- 2) In compliance with the standards and provisions of the City's Zoning Ordinance.
- 3) That there will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed development.
- 4) That the development will not result in the creation of individual lots with such physical constraints to development that building on those lots according to pertinent regulations and building standards would be impracticable.
- 5) That the proposed development possesses adequate and permanent access to a public street.

The Planning Department recommendation was to grant preliminary approval with final approval to be through the Administrative Officer upon compliance with the following stipulations:

- 1) That the final subdivision plan shall include all interior angles, flood zone information, and the purpose of the proposed subdivision.
- 2) That the City Engineer shall approve the final development plan prior to recording which shall include, but not limited to, the location of the proposed structure and driveway, existing and proposed utilities and grading, and a note stating that the lowest floor elevation shall be at least three feet above the maximum seasonal high ground water elevation as determined by the designer.
- 3) That two street trees to be approved by the City's Landscape Project Coordinator shall be planted prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy (CO) for the proposed new dwelling.
- 4) That the outstanding sewer assessment shall be paid in full prior to recording.

On the motion of Mr. Constantine, seconded by Mr. Arnold, the Planning Board voted unanimously to adopt the Planning Department's findings and to grant preliminary approval with final approval to be through the Administrative Officer upon compliance with the Planning Department's recommended stipulations.

**Public Hearing**

**Major Subdivision**

**Re-plat of Posnegansett Park**

**Applicant:** Ahmed Abraham  
**Location:** 942 Warwick Avenue  
**Assessor's Plat:** 301  
**Lot(s):** 211, 212, 213 and 232  
**Zoning District:** Residential A-7  
**Land Area:** 27,840 square feet  
**Number of lots:** 3  
**Engineer:** Ocean State Planners, Inc.  
**Ward:** 1

Mr. Richard Bzdyra PLS, of Ocean State Planners represented the applicant and was requesting approval to subdivide four lots to create three lots, one lot with an existing dwelling, one new conforming lot for development and one new nonconforming lot for development with less than the required frontage and lot width on an existing street in a Residential A-7 Zoning District.

Mr. Bzdyra reviewed the history of the application and reiterated the fact that the Planning Board had requested that the applicant redesign Lot 2 to make it rectangular in shape and seek Zoning Board of Review (ZBR) approval to create a lot with less than the require frontage and lot width. Bzdyra then informed the Board that the ZBR had approved the variance request; he also told the Board that the applicant had received all required State of Rhode Island approvals and was now requesting preliminary approval.

Being no questions or comments regarding the proposal the Planning Board heard the Planning Department recommendation.

The Planning Department found the proposal to be generally consistent with Article 1 "Purposes and General Statements" of the City's Development Review Regulations:

- 1) Generally consistent with the Comprehensive Community Plan.
- 2) In compliance with the standards and provisions of the City's Zoning Ordinance; having received Zoning Board of Review approval, Petition #9275, to create a lot for development with less than the required frontage and lot width.
- 3) That there will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed development.

- 4) That the development will not result in the creation of individual lots with such physical constraints to development that building on those lots according to pertinent regulations and building standards would be impracticable, and:
- 5) That the proposed development possesses adequate and permanent access to a public street.

Planning Department recommendation was to grant preliminary approval with final approval to be through the Administrative Officer upon compliance with the following stipulations:

- 1) That the final plan shall include all existing and proposed utilities, in particular the catch basins located at the corner of Urban Avenue and Warwick Avenue.
- 2) That the proposed drywells shall be located away from the proposed dwellings.
- 3) That the final plan shall include a notation stating that the contractor shall obtain a City of Warwick Physical Alteration Permit (PAP) prior to any work performed within the City right-of-way.
- 4) That the final plan shall depict the existing aerial easement associated with Warwick Avenue.
- 5) That the existing dwelling and the proposed new dwellings shall be connected to the Warwick Sewer System.
- 6) That the developer shall receive a permit from the City prior to the removal of trees within the City ROW and the developer shall plant two additional street trees within the City right-of-way to be approved by the City's Landscape Project Coordinator prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy (CO).

On the motion of Mr. Slocum, seconded by Mr. Constantine, the Planning Board voted unanimously to adopt the Planning Department's findings and to grant preliminary approval with final approval to be through the Administrative Officer upon compliance with the Planning Department's recommended stipulations.

**Public Hearing**

**Major Land Development Project**

**Lowe's/Stop and Shop, Phase II**

Applicant:	Carpionato Properties, Inc.
Location:	Greenwich Avenue, Route 5
Assessor's Plat:	271
Lot(s):	001 & 184
Assessor's Plat:	265
Lot(s):	020
Zoning District:	GB, General Business
Land Area:	28.7 acres
Number of lots:	3
Engineer:	Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.
Ward:	8

Attorney, K. Joseph Shekarchi represented the applicant and was requesting Preliminary Approval for Phase II of a Major Land Development Project to construct a new 71,307 square foot supermarket facility and a 42,200 square foot retail building, with a reduction in minimum required parking spaces and a reduction to the minimum required loading spaces per City Council Zone change PCO-35-05.

Attorney Shekarchi introduced Mr. Kelly Coates, Carpionato Properties; Mr. Joseph Mello, Architect, Mr. Rick Dupuis, Professional Engineer, and Mr. Martin Heil, Traffic Engineer, to answer any technical questions that the Board may have.

Mr. Coates then distributed Exhibit Booklets to the Board members which the attorney asked to have accepted as petitioner's Exhibit 1.

Attorney Shekarchi provided a brief history and explanation of the project to the Planning Board and asked the Planning Board and Planning Staff for clarification of stipulations 1, 3 and 4. The attorney reminded the Board that the applicant was seeking preliminary approval and informed the Board and Staff that the stipulations were requesting action prior to preliminary approval.

The Planning Staff informed the Planning Board and the applicant of a typographical error and explained that the word "preliminary" should be replaced with "final."

Following the attorney's presentation and explanation, Board member Foster inquired about the requested parking relief. Ms. Foster stated that she remembered the Master Plan approval of the project and could not recall that the applicant had requested relief from the parking requirements. Ms. Foster was troubled by the fact that the applicant had been granted a City Council Zone Change with the recommendation of the Planning Board but that the Board had not been

informed that the project would require parking relief. Ms. Foster questioned how the relief was granted without a recommendation from the Planning Board. Ms. Foster was concerned that the City Council may have been misinformed of the Planning Board's recommendation for the Zone Change.

Attorney Shekarchi explained that it is the City Council prerogative to grant zoning relief within zone change applications and that the Planning Board makes nonbinding recommendations to the City Council.

Ms. Foster responded that she understood the Planning Board's responsibility but that she was concerned that the City Council had granted zoning relief without the benefit of the Planning Board's review and recommendation. Ms. Foster further explained that she was not against the project and may have even issued a favorable recommendation to the City Council but was dismayed that the Planning Board did not have the opportunity to do so.

Mr. Coates apologized for any confusion and explained that the project had not changed from the project that was presented to the Planning Board at master plan approval. He stated that the layout and the parking are exactly the same and that the master plan that was approved by the Board also had less than the required parking.

Board member Slocum explained that there was sensitivity about Stop & Shop parking requirements because of a project that was recently considered by the Planning Board in which Stop & Shop attempted to locate a gasoline station at one of its stores that had insufficient parking.

Mr. Slocum then inquired about the circulation pattern in front of the Stop & Shop and whether the applicant was concerned about pedestrian access to three building.

Mr. Coates explained that they had looked at the circulation patterns and that they were comfortable with the layout because of the orientation of the other building on the parcel. He explained that the property had a second access that would relieve vehicular circulation in front of the Stop & Shop.

Being no questions or comments regarding the proposal the Planning Board heard the Planning Department recommendation.

The Planning Department found the proposal to be generally consistent with Article 1 "Purposes and General Statements" of the City's Development Review Regulations and

- 1) Generally consistent with the Comprehensive Community Plan.
- 2) In compliance with the standards and provisions of the City Council Zone change PCO-35-05 allowing for a reduction in minimum required parking spaces and a reduction to the minimum required loading spaces.

- 3) That there will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed development.
- 4) That the development will not result in the creation of individual lots with such physical constraints to development that building on those lots according to pertinent regulations and building standards would be impracticable.
- 5) That the proposed development possesses adequate access to a public street.

Planning Department recommendation was to grant Preliminary approval with Final Approval to be through the Administrative Officer upon compliance with the following stipulations:

- 1) That the final plan shall include a landscape plan designed and stamped by a Rhode Island Registered Landscape Architect and approved by the Warwick Landscape Project Coordinator.
- 2) That the buildings shall be limited to retail use only; no restaurant use to be permitted without additional review.
- 3) That the interior plumbing plans for the proposed buildings and design information and engineering data on the proposed pump station, shall be approved by the Warwick Sewer Authority, prior to final approval.
- 4) That the developer shall consult with the Rhode Island Public Transit Authority (RIPTA) regarding pedestrian access within the site, prior to final approval.
- 5) That a note be added to the preliminary plan stating that the Design Engineer must submit an "As-Built" plan and certification that the construction is in compliance with the design plans for all elements of the storm drainage system and that the "As-Built" drawings and a Certification of Conformance must be submitted and approved by the City Engineer prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.
- 6) That a note be added to the Plans stating that the contractor shall obtain a Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Permit from the Building Department prior to commencing construction.
- 7) That the developer shall obtain approval from the Narragansett Electric Company for any work within or proposed use of the existing electric easement.
- 8) That prior to Final Approval the Applicant shall receive City Council authorization for the purchase of the parcel of City owned land located within the development area.
- 9) That the proposed water stops must be coordinated with the Water Division and the construction schedule for the new line being installed as part of the RIDOT Route 5 reconstruction project.

10) That a detail must be provided relative to backflow protection and the proposed meter pits.

On the motion of Mr. Constantine, seconded by Mr. Gambardella, the Planning Board voted unanimously to adopt the Planning Department's findings and to grant preliminary approval with final approval to be through the Administrative Officer upon compliance with the Planning Department's recommended stipulations.

### **Public Hearing**

#### **Major Land Development Project**

#### **Inskip/Mini Cooper Car Dealership**

Applicant:	Inskip Management Co., Inc.
Location:	1515 Bald Hill Road
Assessor's Plat:	249
Lot(s):	003
Zoning District:	GB, General Business
Land Area:	889,189 square feet
Number of lots:	1
Engineer:	Pare Engineering
Ward:	8

Attorney John C. Revens represented the applicant and was requesting Master Plan approval of a Major Land Development Project to construct a new 8,830 square foot auto dealership within the existing auto dealership complex and to increase the size of an existing car wash facility on a lot with less than required off-street parking, less than required landscaping and relief from the required loading spaces.

Attorney Revens explained that the Planning Board had approved the previous plan to redevelop the site and that construction was now underway. He further explained that Inskip now has the opportunity to add a new Mini Cooper dealership. The attorney explained that the current application was to add the 8,830 square foot Mini Cooper dealership and an addition to the existing car wash. The attorney further explained that there was a mathematical error in the original master plan approved in 2003. The total square footage was presented as 272,062 s.f. while the plan actually included 277,062 s.f. He further explained that the applicant was now requesting a total building area of 284,260 s.f. with the proposed new building and car wash addition.

Attorney Revens then explained the parking arrangement. He stated that the overall development required 1,425 parking spaces under the zoning code, that the applicant was providing a combination of 1068 customer and inventory spaces which were highlighted on the site plan with an additional 1070 Zoning Board approved parking spaces located off site and within the adjoining commercial condominium complex for a total of 2,238 parking spaces.

The attorney also explained that Inskip shuttled its employees to the facility from the off site parking area and that the majority of the customer traffic resulted from vehicle service. He explained that vehicle service parking was valet parking and primarily indoors. Revens also informed the Planning Board that Inskip's maximum daily traffic was approximately 300 vehicles.

Attorney Revens then acknowledged the abutting neighborhood and the drainage problems it was experiencing. He explained that Inskip had totally redesigned its drainage system as part of the original approval and that according to the engineers, Inskip had substantially improved the drainage for the site.

Revens then introduced Mr. Scott Lindgren, PE., Pare Engineering; who explained the detailed drainage analysis and drainage design that Pare had performed prior to developing the site. Mr. Lindgren explained that substantial drainage from the site was now being contained in infiltration systems and that portions of the drainage along the easterly side of the development were redirected into the state drain along Route 2. Mr. Lindgren concluded that the new drainage system removed between 30 and 50% of the drainage from the system that was contributing to the flooding in the adjacent neighborhood.

Board member Foster commented that the site lacked landscaping, in particular within the parking lots.

Attorney Revens responded that the applicant had actually increased the landscaping and replaced mulch and stone islands with irrigation and grass.

The Board then opened the meeting to public comment.

Ms. Janice Hanson of 510 Gauvin Drive submitted a letter for the record and expressed concern about the drainage in the area. Ms. Hanson explained that several of the homes along Gauvin Drive had been severely flooded approximately five months ago and that the residents still can't live in their homes. Ms. Hanson requested that the Planning Board consider a moratorium on development in the area.

Attorney Joseph Remeaker, who represents several Gauvin Drive neighbors, asked for a 30 day continuance so that the neighbors could hire an engineer to review the Inskip drainage plans and determine if the development actually has an effect on the drainage in the area. The attorney explained that he had an estimate from OHI Engineering to perform the drainage review on behalf of the neighbors.

The City Engineer, John DeLucia, explained that the City took the proper standard of care when reviewing the drainage plans and report and stated that the Gauvin Drive area is a high risk area for flooding. He further stated that the City experienced an unusual storm event on October 15, 2005 and that much of the City had been flooded.

Mr. DeLucia concluded his comments by explaining that the City was in the process of developing a Request for Proposals (RFP) to perform a drainage study of the effected area.

Board member Foster explained to the residents that only the City Council can impose a moratorium on development.

Ms. Judy Flawless of Gauvin Drive expressed concern about flooding. She stated that Inskip builds everything just outside of what it needs to be. She stated that they requested a certain square footage and built outside of what they requested and now they are back asking for more development.

Ms. Flawless also disputed the availability of parking and the number of customers that visit Inskip. She stated that she has visited the facility looking for a car and that there is not enough parking; she also said that at the time she was there that there were at least 25 other people looking at cars.

Mr. Joseph McGarry of 522 Gauvin Drive said he has lived in his home for 25 years and has never experienced such flooding. He believes that the Inskip development along with the other development in the area is causing the flooding problems.

Dr. Coletti of Gauvin Drive stated that DEM was performing a drainage study and asked the applicant to wait until that study was complete before proceeding with the application.

Mr. Paul and Mrs. Laurie Francisco of 495 Gauvin Drive supported the residents request for a 30 day continuance.

The Board asked its Solicitor Mr. Earle if it could continue the matter for 30 days.

Mr. Earle responded that the board could continue the application if it determined that there was cause and that the applicant would not suffer irreparable harm.

Attorney Revens stated that Inskip had a time sensitive contract with Mini Cooper and that a delay could result in a loss of the dealership. The attorney further explained that it was a multi-layered approval process and that the resident's engineer would have plenty of time to review the drainage plan prior to the development receiving final approval.

Mr. Derek Anderson of Gilbert Drive stated that there appeared to be a "Mexican Standoff" between the neighbors and the applicant. He stated that he did not see an adverse effect if the Planning Board was to continue the application 30 days.

Being no further testimony the Planning Board then heard the Planning Department's findings and recommendation.

The Planning Department found the proposal to be generally consistent with Article 1 "Purposes and General Statements" of the City's Development Review Regulations and

- 1) Generally consistent with the Comprehensive Community Plan.
- 2) Not in compliance with the standards and provisions of the City's Zoning Ordinance therefore requiring Zoning Board of Review approval to construct a new 8,830 square foot auto dealership within the existing auto sales complex and to increase the size of an existing car wash facility on a lot with an existing variance for less than required parking and landscaping and loading spaces.
- 3) That there will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed development.
- 4) That the development will not result in the creation of individual lots with such physical constraints to development that building on those lots according to pertinent regulations and building standards would be impracticable.
- 5) That the proposed development possesses adequate access to a public street.

Planning Department recommendation was to grant Master Plan approval with the following stipulations:

- 1) Expand a car dealership on a lot with less than required parking, landscaping and loading areas.
- 2) That a parking plan shall be prepared which delineates public parking and areas used exclusively for vehicle display which shall be submitted for Zoning Board of Review approval.
- 3) That striping shall be installed at the approach to Inskip Way at Bald Hill Road to improve vehicle flow, as recommended in the traffic impact statement prepared by Pare Engineering Corporation, dated February 24, 2006, prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy.
- 4) That fire hydrants shall be spaced 300' apart and a hydrant must be installed within 100' of all Fire Department Connections (FDC).
- 5) That the preliminary plans shall update the "Index of Drawings" to reflect all drawings submitted.

- 6) That the Applicant received approval from Kent County Water Authority and the West Warwick Sewer Authority prior to preliminary approval.
- 7) That the preliminary plan shall include a landscape plan designed and stamped by a Rhode Island Registered Landscape Architect and approved by the Warwick Landscape Project Coordinator.
- 8) That all previous stipulations, restrictions and conditions imposed by the Planning Board and Zoning Board of Review shall remain in effect on the property.

On the motion of Mr. Slocum, seconded by Mr. Constantine, the Planning Board voted unanimously to adopt the Planning Department’s findings and to grant master plan approval with the Planning Department’s recommended stipulations and the additional stipulation that the applicant may not appear before the Warwick Planning Board until forty five (45) days from the date of the formal decision in order to allow sufficient time for the abutters engineer to review the Inskip drainage plan and determine its effect on the Gauvin Drive neighborhood.

### **Public Informational Meeting**

#### **Major Subdivision**

#### **Cowesett Farm**

<b>Applicant:</b>	Cowesett Farm LLC.
<b>Location:</b>	821 Cowesett Road
<b>Assessor’s Plat:</b>	239
<b>Lot:</b>	Portion of lot 8
<b>Zoning District:</b>	Residential A-15
<b>Land Area:</b>	19 acres
<b>Number of lots:</b>	36
<b>Engineer:</b>	DiPrete Engineering Associates, Inc.
<b>Ward:</b>	8

Attorney John C. Revens represented the applicant and was requesting master plan approval of a Major Subdivision in order to subdivide a 19 acre portion of a 94 acre lot, to allow for the development of 36 single family house lots in an A-15 Zoning District and a waiver from Development Review Regulations, Section D.2.1 (a) “Access” to have one access point to a standard subdivision and Section D.2.7 (b) “Storm-water structures” to have a storm-water structure on an adjacent lot.

Attorney Revens identified the location of the site as a portion of the Beagle Club due north of Carey Estates. The attorney explained that the applicant wishes to create single family house lots of 15,000 square feet or more. The attorney explained that the access would be from Blue Ridge Road would create a loop within the new development and would exit back out onto Blue Ridge Road. He further explained that the development meets all the City’s regulations except for

having two means of egress for which the applicant was requesting a waiver from the Planning Board.

The attorney further explained that if the development was a cluster it would not require the waiver. However in a cluster development the lots would be smaller but there would be 1000 linear feet less roadway and open space throughout the development. The attorney further explained that it was the applicants desire to build the conventional subdivision.

The attorney also explained that the plan shows access into abutting undeveloped property because that what you're supposed to do. Attorney Revens also explained that his client had performed outreach to the abutting neighborhood and that the neighbors didn't want the roadways to continue into the abutting property. He also stated that the neighbors had requested that construction access be through the Beagle Club. Attorney Revens stated that his client was willing to eliminate the ability of street extensions if the Planning Board agreed and that his client would approach the Beagle Club to allow construction access through the site.

The attorney also mentioned that the abutters had requested buffers between the new development and the existing Blue Ridge Road neighborhood. He stated that buffers were unusual between residential developments but that his client was willing to consider a landscape buffer of some sort.

Revens then introduced Mr. Chris Duhamel, PE., DePrete Engineering; who explained the details of the site and the development. Mr. Duhamel that the development was comprised of approximately 19 acres located at the end of Blue Ridge Road an improved 50 right of way (ROW). He further explained that there was a remaining 75 acres that were not to be developed.

Duhamel explained that the applicant had performed soil testing and that there was approximately a 2 foot water table and 4 foot to ledge in some areas. He concluded that the soil was suitable for ISDS systems. The engineer then described the general terrain of the property including some older fencing, stone walls, trees and pathways. He also explained that the City Fire Marshall had reviewed the plans and had no concerns except to request hydrants throughout the development spaces 300 feet apart.

Mr. Duhamel explained that the proposed lots were rectangular in shape ranging from 15,000 to 32,000 square feet, averaging 18,000 s.f. and all in conformance with the City's zoning regulations.

The engineer also stated that the development would provide underground drainage, with the conventional development proposing an off-site easement and the cluster having the drainage within the development. He also informed the Board that the development would have underground utilities, ISDS, that the water would be from the Kent County Water Authority (KCWA) and that the roadways would consist of 50 foot ROW with 28-feet of pavement, concrete curbing and sidewalks.

Duhamel explained that the conventional subdivision would provide larger lots than the cluster development and could accommodate larger homes but that it also resulted in more roadway and drainage.

Duhamel then addressed the potential for the buffers stating that they would be comprised of plantings to be maintained by the homeowner. Where the cluster development provided a 40 foot buffer from the Blue Ridge Road development, as well as, 5 acres of open space which would be owned and maintained by a homeowner's association.

The Planning Board then accepted public comment.

Mr. Bill Cole of 3 Alicia Circle stated that he was speaking for a group of residents and that they enjoyed the current neighborhood and Blue Ridge Road as it exists. He asked the Planning Board and the developer to consider a "no cut zone" around the perimeter of the new development, no provision for additional roadway extensions into adjoining undeveloped land, that the construction access be through the Beagle Club and that there be buffers "no cut zones" between the new development and the abutting lots in the Blue Ridge Road neighborhood.

Mr. Bill Cromley of 3 Alana Court requested "no cut zones" and stated that he preferred the conventional subdivision over the cluster.

Mr. Anthony Bucci of 373 Blue Ridge Road asked the Planning Department to state its position on the development.

The Planning Department stated that it had reviewed both the standard subdivision (which is the applicants preferred development) and the cluster development. And that while the Cluster Development is intended for comparative purposes only, the Planning Department prefers the cluster development to the standard subdivision for the following reasons; the cluster development does not require any waivers from the City's Regulations, the cluster development preserves substantial areas of open space, the cluster development provides relief to the neighbors to the south by providing common area to be preserved as a buffer between the existing homes and proposed development and finally the cluster development results in less impervious area with fewer roadways and therefore less maintenance.

Mr. Derek Anderson of Gilbert Stuart Drive was concerned about the availability of water service from the KCWA.

Mr. Duhamel responded that the developer is required to provide engineering to the KCWA for approval but did not expect that there would be a problem providing water volume and pressure.

Ms. Judy Forman of 21 Alicia Circle was concerned about blasting and asked if each plan (conventional and cluster) had provisions for buffers.

Mr. Duhamel responded that he did not expect that blasting would be necessary. Duhamel also stated that the cluster provided a 40 foot buffer while the conventional subdivision did not include a buffer. He further stated that evergreens could be planted along the stonewall between the properties to provide screening.

Ms. Farman asked if the cluster lots could accommodate a 2,400 s.f. house on a 12,000 s.f. lot, she also stated that she liked all of the open space provided in the cluster development.

Attorney Revens stated that the developer would consider deed restrictions on the lots to limit the location of the buildings and to require them to be of similar size as the Blue Ridge development.

Mr. Bucci of 373 Blue Ridge Road asked if the developer would be willing to transfer the three lots abutting the Blue Ridge Development to the City's Land Trust for preservation.

The developer agreed to consider the request.

Being no further comment the Planning Board then heard the Planning Departments comments.

The Planning Department found the proposal to be generally consistent with Article 1 "Purposes and General Statements" of the City's Development Review Regulations, and:

- 1) Consistent with the Comprehensive Community Plan.
- 2) In compliance with the standards and provisions of the City's Zoning Ordinance.
- 3) That there will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed development.
- 4) That the development will not result in the creation of individual lots with such physical constraints to development that building on those lots according to pertinent regulations and building standards would be impracticable.
- 5) That the proposed development possesses adequate access to a public street.

Planning Departments recommendation was to grant Master Plan approval with the following stipulations:

- 1) That the applicant shall demonstrate credible evidence that there will be no adverse effect to the public health, safety and welfare resulting from the requested waiver of Development Review Regulation Section D.2.1 (a) "Access" to have one access point to the proposed development.

- 2) That the developer shall conform to Development Review Regulations Section D.2.7 (b) “Storm-water structures” and shall incorporate the proposed storm-water drainage system into the proposed development on a separate lot not intended for development and not on an adjacent lot by means of an easement.
- 3) That the applicant shall receive a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Warwick Historic District Commission for the alteration of any existing stone walls within the proposed development as required in Warwick Zoning Ordinance Section 311.10 “Stone Walls.”
- 4) That all proposed cul-de-sacs with provisions for future roadway extension shall be redesigned to eliminate the potential for continuation and development of adjoining parcels through the development.
- 5) That the preliminary plans shall include all existing and proposed utilities, existing and proposed grading, and a notation that all dwellings shall be at least three feet above the maximum seasonal high ground water elevation as determined by the designer.
- 6) The preliminary landscape plan shall include the delineation of all wooded areas on a legible layer, all trees (clusters) that will be preserved as part of the development, proposed grading, utilities and proximity to construction and proposed species and location of new street trees.
- 7) The preliminary plan shall include additional fire hydrants dispersed throughout the development spaced no more than 300 feet apart and providing a minimum flow rate of 100 gpm.
- 8) That dead end roadways longer than 150 feet shall provide turning capabilities for fire apparatus as per NFPA-1 2003 edition.
- 9) That the developer shall contribute funds-in-lieu-of open space based on thirty-six new lots for development in order to address inadequate supply of play grounds, play fields and neighborhood parks as documented in the City’s Comprehensive Plan for Recreation District seven.

**Administrative Subdivisions**

The Planning Staff presented the following Administrative Subdivisions for informational purposes.

Providence Street & Carrs Lane	Plat: 261	Lots: 61 & 71
Cowesett Road & Blue Ridge Road	Plats: 239 & 240	Lots: 22 & 3

Being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:10 P.M.

